

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, the application included claims 12-31. No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 12-31 stand pending for examination.

Claims 12-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,923,744 to Cheng ("Cheng").

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Applicants respectfully traverse the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Office Action does not cite a reference for each and every claim element as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The pending Office Action (pp. 2, 3) plainly states that Cheng does not teach a number of elements. For convenience, claim 12 is reproduced below with the elements not taught by Chung underlined:

12. A method for routing calls comprising:
- at a service switching point associated with a subscriber line having switched-based call forwarding to voicemail associated therewith and having a specific digit string associated therewith, detecting an Off-Hook Delay trigger, wherein the Off-Hook Delay trigger includes a forward-to number;
 - suspending call processing to the forward-to number;
 - sending an infocollected message to a service control point associated with an Advanced Intelligent Network, wherein the infocollected message includes the specific digit string and the forward-to number;
 - comparing the forward-to number to a voicemail number associated with the subscriber line; and

based on the comparison determining whether to resume call
processing to the forward-to number.

Because the cited reference does not teach each and every claim element, the Office Action has not established a prima facie case of obviousness, and claim 12 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Moreover, even the claim element said to be taught by Cheng is not. Cheng does not teach that the subscriber line has switch-based call forwarding to voicemail associated therewith. At the location cited by the Office Action (col. 3, ll. 28-30), Cheng teaches interaction in an intelligent network (IN). Cheng is silent regarding switch-based features, specifically switch-based call forwarding to voicemail. Hence, claim 12 is believed to be allowable, at least for this additional reason.

Further, Cheng does not teach “detecting an Off-Hook Delay trigger.” An Off-Hook Delay trigger is returned from the subscriber line and initiates further processing by the SSP. The cited passage of Cheng (col. 3, ll. 10-30), however, discusses processing IN triggers “[i]n response to an incoming call connection towards a particular subscriber.” “If the subscriber is not associated with any trigger, an incoming call is allowed to be terminated directly towards the called party subscriber.” Cheng, however, is silent regarding call processing upon receipt of an Off-Hook Delay trigger, including one having a forward-to number. Hence, claim 12 is believed to be allowable, at least for this additional reason.

Claim 27 includes a number of limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 12. Hence, claim 27 is believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons discussed above.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and are believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 17, 2008

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61225117 v1